

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-5 are rejected.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gräser
(Technological Solutions to Autonomous Robot Control, 1998).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Rejection of claims 1-5 as being anticipated by Gräser

Claim 1 requires the robot to be installed in a semiconductor manufacturing system. Further, requires a teaching jig mounted that is mounted on a placement portion of the robot in place of the object during a teaching operation. Further, the teaching jig is required to have a positioning mechanism with respect to the placement portion.

Gräser does not disclose a robot system that is installed in a semiconductor manufacturing system. As the Examiner admits in item 5 of the Office Action, Gräser discloses an autonomous robot. Such an autonomous robot cannot be installed in a semiconductor manufacturing system. Importantly, Gräser relates to a service robot, and does not operate in a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus as in the present invention.

Further, there is no disclosure in Gräser relating to a teaching jig or its constitution. Since there is no disclosure of a teaching jig, there cannot be any disclosure in Gräser related to mounting the teaching jig on a placement portion of the robot in place of an object during a

teaching operation. Likewise, there also cannot be any disclosure related to the teaching jig having a positioning mechanism with respect to the placement portion.

In Gräser (as shown in figure 1), an outer shape (silhouette) of an arm changes (enlarges) by installing a camera on the arm. On the other hand, a teaching jig with a camera is placed instead of an object on the placement portion without affecting the outer shape in the present invention.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Examiner has not established anticipation of claim 1 based on Gräser at least because of the above-noted differences between the teachings of Gräser and the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Claim 2 is a method claim that includes limitations analogous to the ones described above in relation to claim 1. Therefore, it is allowable at least for analogous reasons.

Claims 2-5 are dependent on claim 2 and are allowable at least for the same reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/521,572

Attorney Docket No.: Q85803

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355

Date: October 15, 2009